

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                         | FILING DATE    | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
|---|----------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/812,033                              | 03/30/2004     | Philippe Monteil     | 119150              | 1429             |  |
| 25944 75                                | 590 12/15/2005 |                      | EXAMINER            |                  |  |
| OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC<br>P.O. BOX 19928 |                |                      | BRAHAN, 1           | BRAHAN, THOMAS J |  |
| ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320                    |                |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |  |
|   | •              |                      | 3654                |                  |  |

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|  | Application No.  | Applicant(s)  |     |  |  |  |
|--|--|---|-----|--|--|--|
| Office Astion Comments   | 10/812,033   | MONTEIL ET AL.  |     |  |  |  |
| Office Action Summary  | Examiner   | Art Unit  |     |  |  |  |
|  | Thomas J. Brahan   | 3654  |     |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app<br>Period for Reply   | pears on the cover sheet with the c  | orrespondence address   | s   |  |  |  |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timwill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE | l. ely filed the mailing date of this commun (35 U.S.C. § 133). |     |  |  |  |
| Status   |  |   |     |  |  |  |
| 1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 M   | larch 2004.  |   |     |  |  |  |
| <u></u> :  | action is non-final.   |   |     |  |  |  |
| ,  |  |   |     |  |  |  |
| ,  | closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.  |   |     |  |  |  |
| Disposition of Claims  |  |   |     |  |  |  |
| 4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or   | wn from consideration.   |   |     |  |  |  |
| Application Papers   |  |   |     |  |  |  |
| 9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine  | er.  |   |     |  |  |  |
|  | 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: ⋅a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  |   |     |  |  |  |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  |  |   |     |  |  |  |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).   |  |   |     |  |  |  |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex   | kaminer. Note the attached Office  | Action or form PTO-18   | 52. |  |  |  |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119   |  |   |     |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1 Certified copies of the priority document</li> <li>2 Certified copies of the priority document</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list</li> </ul>  | es have been received. Es have been received in Application rity documents have been received in PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  | on No<br>ed in this National Stag                               | ge  |  |  |  |
| Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/5/04.  | 4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Do 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:   |   | )   |  |  |  |

Application/Control Number: 10/812,033

Page 2

Art Unit: 3654

- 1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

  The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which applicant regards as his invention.
- 2. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and fail to conform with current U.S. practice. For example:
  - a. In claim 1, line 1, the limitation "in particular for a tower crane" renders the claims indefinite, as it is unclear as to whether or not a tower crane is being claimed.
  - b. In claim 1, line 4, the use of the term "this device" is awkward and confusing.
  - c. In claim 1, line 8, the term "the end regions" lacks antecedent basis within the claim.
  - d. In claim 2, lines 4 and 5, the term "the suspension hooks" lacks antecedent basis within the claims.
  - e. In claim 3, line 2, the term "the two bar profiles" lacks antecedent basis within the claims.
  - f. In claim 4, line 2, and in the last line of claim 6, the term "the rear part" lacks antecedent basis within the claims.
  - g. Claim 7, line 4 refers to "a gripping hook" without correlating this hook with those already present in the claimed combination of elements.
  - h. In claim 9, lines 3 and 4, the limitation "on each ballast block, conical centering pins the protrude" is awkward and confusing.
  - i. In the penultimate line of claim 9, the limitation "in particular of conical or pyramidal shape" fails to positively recite the structure of the claimed invention.
  - j. All of the structures recited in claim 11 lack antecedent basis within the claims. This claim should not depend from claim 2.
- 3. Potter et al, Hoyerman, Pech and Muta et al are cited as showing related counterweight handling means. The claims appear to include subject matter which defines over this references.

Art Unit: 3654

<u>direct.uspto.gov</u>. Questions regarding access to the Private PAIR system, should be directed to the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Thomas J. Brahan Primary Examiner Art Unit 36544